



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

two for the delight of a more microscopic reviewer. The following words seem deserving of fuller treatment, or else of a special note:

Hallarse con: cf. p. 18, l. 9, "se hallaba con que se había ofrecido."

Llevar should be translated "bring," in order to fit the use on p. 23, l. 25.

Contigo (24:10) seems meaningless if translated "with you" (*sic* vocab.).

Pundonor (25:3) is hardly "point of honor" so much as "sense of honor."

El de más allá (42:17) does not seem clear from the vocabulary meanings of *más allá* ("farther on," "beyond").

Arreglar el pozo (43:28) will be translated as "arrange the well," if the vocabulary be followed. One suspects another meaning.

Convenir is given only as an active verb with the conventional meanings. This hardly seems to fit *la señora que se convenía á todo* (50:6).

The reviewer takes the liberty of adding one or two suggestions, without any insinuation that the implied omissions are culpable. (1) The reference to Maiquez (page 40, line 12) would not have been damaged by mentioning Cotarelo y Mori's interesting book, *Isidoro Maiquez y el teatro de su tiempo* (Madrid, 1902). (2) It may add interest to the mention of Utrilla y Rouget, "leading tailors of the day" (54:27), to inform the reader that the former is mentioned by Mesonero himself in his *Manual*, while Rouget's name appears in the celebrated *Handbook* of Richard Ford. (3) The *figuras de capuz* and *siniestros bultos* of page 57, line 13, may take on particular significance from the fact that, two or three years before the date of the essay in which the expressions occur, Escosura had published in *El Artista* a semi-romantic legend entitled *El bulto vestido del negro capuz* (Cf. also Espronceda, *Obras* 1884, page 55). (4) *Perfectibilidad social* (77:29) evidently refers to ideas prevailing in France in the eighteenth century, with which Mesonero would have had scant sympathy.

PHILIP H. CHURCHMAN.

Clark College.

URBAN CRONAN, *Teatro español del siglo XVI*. Tomo primero. (Sociedad de bibliófilos madrileños, X.) Madrid, 1913. 8vo., x + 547 pp.

In the past students of the early Spanish drama have been hampered seriously by the lack of available texts of the minor dramatists, but recent publications have now made accessible nearly all the dramatic material of the first half of the sixteenth century. Of the late collections, the above-mentioned volume is the most important, not only for the large amount of material it contains, but also for the importance of the texts it reproduces. The list is as follows:

Comedia Tideia, by Francisco de las Natas.—*Comedia Tesorina* and *Comedia Vidriana*,¹ by Jayme de Guete.—*Tragicomedia alegórica del parayso y del infierno*.—*Farsa*, by Fernando Diaz.—*Egloga pastoril*.—*Egloga nueva*.—*Egloga*, by Juan de Paris.—*Farsa del mundo* and *Farsa sobre la felice nueva de la concordia y paz*, by Fernan Lopez de Yanguas.—*Farsa Rosiela*. These plays, the originals of which are to be found either in the National Library at Madrid or in the Royal Library in Munich, are well known to bibliographers, but they offer an almost untouched mine for linguistic and literary study.

In praiseworthy contrast to those editors who have been content to publish works from the editions nearest at hand when older ones were known to exist, Cronan has spared no pains to give a text based on a comparison of all the extant editions of the older period. He has aimed to reproduce these with the least possible change. "Hemos conservado la ortografía de los textos originales, limitándonos á extender las abreviaturas² y subsanar las erratas evidentes." When but one old text is extant,

¹ In the *Romanic Review*, Vol. I (1910), p. 459, I announced that I was preparing an edition of the *Comedia Vidriana*. Although everything that pertains to the study of the text remains to be done, the play is not important enough to justify a second edition at this time.

² Abbreviations rarely give trouble in these texts. However, p. 503, line 284, should read, "Porque poneys (not podeys) los dos juntos."

there are, under these principles, but two serious sources of error, mistakes in copying and erroneous emendation. In order to show the condition of the original texts, and to test the accuracy of the present edition, all the variants³ (with the exception of abbreviations) of the original print of the *Comedia Vidriana* to the end of the second act (1216 lines) are here given:

On the title-page the name of the author is given as Gueta, line 49 aquistas, 59 diabra, 186 toda, 187 vexa, 222 may, 278 majadero, 281 iamas, 290 mia, 361 escuas, 501 desseal, 606 enlestabro, 619 aquin, 620 desgarre, 660 atorgados, 732 aguda, 770 momoria, 772 escaria, 820 sufrimiente, 853 entiendo vs, 854 dientes, 883 trista, 905 bios, 1073 essarga, 1101 dexillo, 1157 ciertamente, 1165 contingo, 1184 vezas.

It is at once apparent that extraordinary liberties have been taken in emending the text without accounting for the original readings in the notes. *Enlestabro* is supported by line 302 and is probably the correct reading for 271, *aquin* is accepted in the text in line 855, the orthography of *entiendo* vs is supported by 1451 *yo* vs and the *Tesorina* 1509 *no* vs, *bios* seems to be a euphemistic form here as also in the *Tesorina* 1049, *trista* is a good Aragonese form, *mia* and *ciertamente* are found frequently, a garbled form like *momoria* in the mouth of Cetina is not surprising, and it is not at all certain that *majadero*, *escuas* and *atorgados* are misprints. The faulty readings of lines 187 and 620 are simply slips on the part of the modern editor or printer.

For the rest of this text the rejected readings of the original are given when they seem to be correct, and also within parentheses when doubtful:

1384 no son, 1399 a esta, (1408 cayga), (1411 entendio), 1451 vs, 1466 Sam, (1785 esso), (1928 seguedad), (1981 llabas), (2018 pansar), (2040 damanda), (it is safer not to correct the speech of Perucho even though it reads 2083 tado, 2084 espanto, 2088 las, 2154 vas), 2165 vltraje, (2219 enxabonarras), 2286 dessa, 2368 rinña (if linñaje is to stand in 2168),

(2445 pesera), (2460 offenderora), 2780 (y) ya, 2874 o que afan.

In the case of the *Tesorina* there are two existing texts. Cronan evidently chose the Madrid print as the basis for his edition, but he did not follow it as rigidly as he should. This text has several points in its favor: It is apparently about fifteen years older than the Munich print, and comes from the same press as the *Comedia Vidriana*; it also contains more rare dialect forms. The Munich print shows no emendations that indicate corrections of the author, but popular forms have frequently been rejected in favor of the more current literary ones. It is almost certain that these changes are due to the misguided efforts of a well-meaning printer. The readings of the 1551 text can scarcely have other value than that they represent the opinion of a Spaniard who was practically contemporary with the author. It is a serious error on Cronan's part to accept readings from the reprint when the earlier text could be shown to be correct.

In the following list the forms of the Madrid print are given that should, in the opinion of the reviewer, be restored to the text. The forms in parentheses are doubtful, and perhaps not always worth noting, but as they frequently show tendencies in similar directions, it seems rather unsafe to classify them as misprints:

Line 27 amostro, 53 parecen, 58 ellotro (similar emendation in 232, but compare 947 enell ayre, 1191 and 2373 ell ombre), 77 terciopado (intentional blunder), 116 aga, 127 desfregada, 141 vng moço con vng galan, 206 scuchara, 232 ellaltura, 241 quijeres (see below, 950 and 2278), 245 fundamento, 339 ven, 417 qualquiere (cf. 2236), 448 mal, 451 otro, (495 the emendation is not convincing), 501 has, 521 mulata, 619 adiutoriz?, 692 vez (cf. 963), 709 vna, 723 ahos (cf. 132, 144, etc.), 742 Amnon, 747 v Orphee (= u, cf. 2165), (748 y phio), 794 en, 805 pues que Dios te, 832 calor, 845 lignage, 888 sentemiento, 907 trista, 913 cocez, 917 aguardas, 919 entra, 950 quigesse, 963 vezte, 979 trizte, 989 drento (cf. *Vidriana* 818), (997 paraceiz), 1031 huavs, 1033 en layre, 1049 bios, 1059 echeis (the emended form is of course what one would expect here), (1104 embidio, but cf. 1378), 1192 hablabais, (1221 mosorrabes), 1245 las bispas, (1257 sabacos), 1280 virgam (Gilyracho's

³ The variants cited have been taken from my own copies, but to insure reasonable accuracy, they have been compared anew with the original texts.

Latin may not be above reproach), (1309 entoces . . . quion), 1342 ni, 1437 hablaredes, (1449 cendero), 1454 vees, (1458 que lo que), 1509 no vs, 1543 en llespital, 1576 allega, (1762 guerta), (1797 Salamon), 1848 reprhende, 1876 desta, 1881 callademente, 1887 azia a, 1896 hartaua, (1905 tenos), 1920 sallida, 1988 jodio (cf. 2440), 2031 Palblo (intentional?), (2037 rason), 2039 andemos, 2054 araña, 2165 v otra, 2230 xallia, 2231 xtar, 2236 qualquiere, 2243 pidiras, 2250 a dalguna . . . phro, 2267 vex, 2269 xinora, 2278 quigeras, 2440 jodio, 2484 vubon?, 2513 sallia, 2519 sallir, 2635 sallid, 2652 Fin.

The variants of the *Vidriana* and the *Tesorina* are sufficient to show the merits as well as the defects of Cronan's work. The care with which he has performed the heavy task of copying, preparing for the printer, and reading the proof of eleven plays, four of them in two editions, deserves only the highest praise. If the amount of material that he handled were not so great, he might be criticised more severely for rejecting so many forms that are capable of justification. However, it would take years to make a critical text, and to explain the difficult passages of the plays that are found in this volume alone. Such a critical text being out of the question, the all-important thing is to have an accurate reproduction of the original. One might even admit that it is permissible to correct without mention certain classes of misprints. In the Gothic type it was easy to confuse such letters as the long *s* with *f* or *n* with *u*, and it does seem pedantic to crowd the variants with such forms as *pnes* for *pues* and *foy* for *soy*. But when, in his effort to make a readable text, the editor emends without mention in the notes dialect forms that can be proven to be correct, or even those that have the slightest chance of justification, the result is that his work is robbed of much of its value for linguistic study. Until more is known of the popular language of the sixteenth century, the safer way will be to give all the readings of the principal edition at least, even at the risk of appearing pedantic.

Two other plays of the volume under review have been compared with the originals without finding material that would modify the opinions expressed above. It is important to note,

however, that the earliest edition of Fernan Lopez de Yanguas' *Farsa del mundo* was overlooked. This text, which dates from 1524, has been described in the catalogues of the libraries of Salvá (No. 1300) and Heredia (No. 2312), and attention has been called to it more recently by Kohler, *Sieben spanische dramatische Eklogen*, 1911, p. 150. Both the 1528 and the 1551-editions appear to be copies of the earlier edition. Cronan's text, although based on the later prints, is not at all unsatisfactory.

Of the remaining texts four had already appeared in the above-mentioned volume of Kohler. Cronan's text of the *Egloga* of Juan de Paris is the better, in that it is based on the 1536 edition with variants of that of 1551, while Kohler used only the later text. The *Farsa* of Fernando Diaz, the *Egloga pastoril*, and the *Egloga nueva* were reprinted by both editors from the old editions now found in the Royal Library at Munich. While both editions are undoubtedly excellent, those who are engaged in linguistic study will prefer Kohler, because he gives in the foot-notes the original readings corresponding to his emendations.

RALPH E. HOUSE.

University of Chicago.

The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser.

Edited with critical notes by J. C. SMITH and E. DE SÉLINCOURT, with an introduction by E. DE SÉLINCOURT and a glossary. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1912. Small 8vo. Pp. lxvii + 736.

The student of Spenser has still to await a single-volume edition which quite supersedes others. Though this Oxford concise Spenser, in view of its tasteful critical introduction, its inclusion of the Spenser-Harvey letters,¹ its facsimile title-pages, and its woodcuts from *The Shepheardes Calendar*, offers the greatest inducements for the least money, yet the Globe

¹ Apparently by afterthought, since the editor (p. xxi, n. 2) refers to them as quoted in Grosart.